



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,529	06/26/2003	Francesco A. Campisano	END920030021US1	4833
23550	7590	02/18/2009	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC			ZHAO, DAQUAN	
75 STATE STREET				
14TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALBANY, NY 12207			2621	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/607,529	CAMPISANO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAQUAN ZHAO	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/6/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/6/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

For claims 1, 8 and 14, there's no description for the newly added limitation: decoding in a single iteration.

Claims 2-7, 9-13 and 15-21 incorporated the same deficiency as set forth in claims 1, 8 and 14 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 14 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al (US 6,473,558 B1), in view of Nagata (US 5,974,224) and further in view of Bohnke (US 6,557,139 B2).

For claim14, Wu et al teach an MPEG-2 buffer scheme for providing enhanced trick mode playback of a video stream (e.g. column 7, lines 52-59 and column 8, lines 17-28, a frame-by-frame reverse play is a type of trick mode playback, the GOP which contains I, P and B frame shown in figures 4-6 are considered to be the video stream), comprising:

a first buffer having a first pointer that is associated with a firs address, and a second buffer having a second pointer that is associated with a second address (e.g. column 8, lines 30-57, frame pointers is used to direct the decoded frame into a memory location, wherein the memory location corresponds to the “address”, the F and B pointer are used for directing the I and P frames to the appropriate frame buffers),

wherein the first pointer is locked to the first buffer and the second pointer is locked to the second buffer (e.g. column 9, lines 11-24, pointers F and B points to frame buffers M1 and M2 during a cycle), and

wherein a set of frames of the video stream comprising at least one I frame and at least zero p frames is decoded for trick mode playback to the first buffer and the second buffer in a strictly alternating fashion based on a continuous swapping of the first address and the second address on a frame by frame basis (e.g. column 9, line 45-column 10, line 23, the pointers alternate between F and B pointers. as shown in figure 5, lines 525, F and B continuously swapping during each cycle to direct the I frame and P frame to different buffer during fast reverse play, because the pointers are use to direct the decoded frame into a memory location (address). Therefore, the first address (address of F point to in a buffer) and the second address (address of B pointing to in a different buffer) are swapping continuously.

frames in the first buffer is immediately followed by a frame in the second buffer and frames in the second buffer is immediately followed by a frame in the first buffer until an end of the video stream (Column 10, lines 7-33 and figure 5 of Wu et al teach the order in which frame buffers M1, M2 and M3 are accessed, which is M1, M2 and then M3 in the first cycle, and M3, M2 and then M1 in the next cycle, Wherein M1 is followed by M2 immediately in the first cycle and M2 is followed by M1 immediately in the second cycle).

However, Wu et al fail to specify using only two buffers to reproduce the video frames; decoding in a single iteration. Nagata teaches using only two buffers to

reproduce the video frames (e.g. figure 8, buffer 91 and 92). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Wu et al using the two buffer taught by Nagata to allow every frame in the first buffer is immediately followed by a frame in the second buffer and every frame in the second buffer is immediately followed by a frame in the first buffer until an end of the video stream. Therefore, it is obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to try using only two buffers instead of three buffers in the system of Wu et al to decode video frame in the alternative fashion and reduce the size of the apparatus or the cost of the apparatus (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR), 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)).

Wu et al and Nagata fail to teach decoding in a single iteration. Bohnke teaches decoding in a single iteration (e.g. abstract, "...at least one decoding iteration on multi-dimensionally coded information..." and column 6, lines 31-38). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bohnke into the teaching of Wu et al and Nagata to enable an optimized and effective iterative decoding of multi-dimensionally coded information (e.g. Bohnke, column 3, lines 50-55).

For claim 20, Wu et al teach the set of frames are part of a group of pictures with a set of B frames (e.g. see column 5, lines 46-60 for GOPs and column 4, lines 1-5 for I P and B frames).

For claim 18, Wu et al teach the display pointer is synchronized with the first address, and wherein the decoded set of frames is read out of the first buffer and the

second buffer in the alternating fashion based on the display pointer (e.g. pointers F and B are for displaying the frames).

For claim 19, Wu et al teach the first buffer is a current buffer and the second buffer is a past buffer (e.g. buffers M1 and M2 are alternating).

For claim 21, Wu et al teach a third buffer, wherein the set of frames are decoded to the first buffer, the second buffer and the third buffer in the alternating fashion based on a continuous swapping of the first address, the second address and a third address (e.g. buffer M5 is consider to be the third buffer).

7. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al (US 6,473,558 B1), Nagata (US 5,974,224) and Bohnke (US 6,557,139 B2), as applied to claims 14 and 18-21 above and further in view of Kim (6,466,733 B1).

See the teaching of Wu et al, Nagata and Bohnke above.

For claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15 and 16, Wu et al, Nagata and Bohnke fail to teach disengagement of a frame synchronization signal within the MPEG-2 decoder. Kim teaches disengagement of a frame synchronization signal within the MPEG-2 decoder (e.g. column 1, lines 27-42 and column 7, lines 32-56, VLD analyzer 118 is considered to be the MPEG2 decoder. The 1-byte sync is separates by the packetizer & mapper 120 follower by the VLD decoder as shown in figure 1. It has been held that making previously separated components integral into one unit without producing any new and unexpected result involves only routine skill in the art. See *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965,

968; 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kim into the teaching of Wu et al, Nagata and Bohnke to increase the stability of a system since Kim suggests to extract the sync block to simplify the error correction process when decoding a signal in a trick play mode (Kim, column 8, line 59-column 9, line 13).

For claim 4, Wu et al teach the first buffer is a current buffer and the second buffer is a past buffer (e.g. buffers M1 and M2 are alternating).

For claim 6, Wu et al teach the set of frames are part of a group of pictures with a set of B frames (e.g. see column 5, lines 46-60 for GOPs and column 4, lines 1-5 for I P and B frames).

For claim 3, Wu et al teach synchronizing a display pointer with the first address and reading the decoded set of frames out of the first buffer and second buffer in the alternating fashion based on the display pointer (e.g. figure 6, frames are display in a sequence using the pointers F and B alternatively).

Claims 7 and 10 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 3 above.

For claim 11, Wu et al teach the first buffer is a current buffer and the second buffer is a past buffer (e.g. buffers M1 and M2 are alternating).

For claim 12, Wu et al teach the set of frames are part of a group of pictures with a set of B frames (e.g. see column 5, lines 46-60 for GOPs and column 4, lines 1-5 for I P and B frames).

For claim 13, Wu et al teach a third buffer, wherein the set of frames are decoded to the first buffer, the second buffer and the third buffer in the alternating fashion based

on a continuous swapping of the first address, the second address and a third address (e.g. buffer M5 is consider to be the third buffer).

For claims 5 and 17, Wu et al teach the first address and the second address are continuously swapped by microcode (e.g. the pointer F and B are considered to be the microcode).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daquan Zhao whose telephone number is (571) 270-1119. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri. 7:30 -5, alt Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Thai Q, can be reached on (571)272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daquan Zhao

/JAMIE JO VENT ATALA/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621